



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the main mere logic. He expounds the method of hypotheses rightly, and correctly interprets the *ικανόν* in a relative and dialectical, not in an absolute and metaphysical, sense. I only regret that on p. 542 he translates *δύο εἶδη τῶν ὄντων* (*Phaedo* 79 A) "Zwei Arte des Wirklichen." **ὄντων* here is a colorless "things," and "Wirklichen" overtranslates it.

In the final chapter, on the "Theory of Ideas" in the *Phaedo* and earlier dialogues, he announces that as he formerly could not find the Aristotelian view of the Platonic idea in the later dialogues, so now he is unable to find it in the earlier works either. I have discussed this point in my review of his Platonic studies (*Class. Phil.* V, 390) and shall recur to it on the appearance of his second volume. I will content myself now with the observation that the Aristotelian misrepresentation that the ideas are *αἰσθητὰ ἀίδια* is not identical with the theory, that they were and always remained for Plato something more than mere concepts. Plato explicitly affirmed that they possess objective and transcendental reality, and he explicitly refuses to define the nature of this reality.

PAUL SHOREY

Aristophanis Cantica Digessit stropharum popularium appendiculam adiecit OTTO SCHROEDER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1909. Pp. vi + 100. M. 2.40.

With the *Aristophanes*, Professor Schroeder completes his rewriting, in terms of the "new metric," of virtually the entire body of extant Greek lyric verse. He is to be congratulated on the accomplishment of a laborious and useful task. Truth, in Bacon's words, more readily emerges from error than from confusion. Even those who are unable to accept all the principles of this metric will be greatly helped in future study of the subject by having at hand a systematic application of them to a large amount of verse.

In spite of the considerable recent literature of discussion of the new metric, few scholars have any clear idea how much difference it makes, or what it means. The amount of difference in practice for *viva-voce* reading could be determined only by an audience of experts listening to the reading of several hundred lines of various measures by Professor Schroeder and by a representative of the old school which once was the new. The difference would probably not be very great. It would perhaps be imperceptible to the untrained ear. Some continuous logaoedics and stately epitrites would perhaps seem to break up into more choppy and lively rhythms. But it is not safe to affirm even this without auditory demonstration.

What then does it all mean? Waiving technicalities and all controversies that turn merely on the choice of terminology and symbols, I think the essence of the matter can be brought under two main heads:

1. The new metric emphasizes the rhythmic division of lines into two

(sometimes, of course, three) equivalent sections, and measures the equivalence broadly in terms of groups of four or five or even eight syllables rather than by the conventional fixed feet or bars of two or three syllables. This may be in part, as I have elsewhere suggested, merely a reinsistence on scansion by dipodies, together with a larger recognition of transposition and substitution in the measuring of equivalents. In any case, I shall not discuss the point further here.

2. The new metric finds in Greek verse a greater tendency to ascending movements than is recognized in logaoedic and dactylo-epitrite scansion. Professor Schroeder in particular, wherever it is possible, gives the second half-line ascending iambic or choriambic and bacchic movement, in loose equivalence to a first half composed of less definitely arranged syllables and quantities. He deserves our thanks for raising a most interesting question, whatever we may think of his contribution to the answer. It is easy enough of course to write out a given series of longs and shorts in either an ascending or descending scheme. But in practice, and when the longs and shorts are embodied in the syllables of actual speech, the determination of the precise line of demarcation between ascending and descending rhythm becomes one of the most delicate and difficult problems of metric. The criteria may be so familiar to Professor Schroeder's mind that he has not thought it worth while to state them. But I can assure him that the matter is far from clear to the majority even of metrists. In descending rhythm, the light or unstressed syllables lean back toward the heavy or stressed syllable. In ascending rhythm, they incline and move forward to it. That is simple enough, and in strongly marked regular anapaests or dactyls there is no difficulty. But in more complicated or shifting rhythms, the test is by no means of easy application for the average ear. No less a metrist than Christ actually affirms that Goethe's *Erl Koenig* is written in descending rhythm. Writers of repute on English metric frequently mistake Byron's and Swinburne's anapaests for dactyls, and even Munro is sometimes in doubt whether a given verse of Tennyson is best treated as trochaic or iambic. In the so-called English hexameters the dactyls are always turning into anapaests, to the surprise and annoyance of their authors. When a poem is set to music under the direction of the poet, we have a certain test of the author's intention. Failing that, we must be guided in living languages by our instinctive feeling for the natural movement of the words, and in a dead language by an acquired instinct supported by a laborious accumulation of facts. Now, much as it is needed, I do not know of the existence of any considerable study of this kind for Greek. Professor Schroeder's instinctive feeling of the true rhythm may convince himself. But to convince others he must show that where he affirms ascending choriambic and bacchic movement in logaoedics or epitrites there is something in the word endings, the

phrasal units, and the relation of unimportant to important syllables that tends to confirm his reading. Such evidence may be inadequate and unsatisfactory. But it is the only evidence that the nature of the case admits. And the next thing to do in the study of Greek metric is to collect it.

Instead of attempting this, Professor Schroeder complicates the already difficult problem of what Greek meter is by a purely conjectural theory of how it came to be—of its evolution. And his main effort thenceforward is to enlist his instincts and force his schemes into the service of this theory. He holds that Greek meters are a development, a fusion of, and a compromise between two distinct prehistoric systems—an Aeolian system which merely counted syllables, regardless of stress or quantity, and an originally ascending “enoplic” system which measured by rhythmic beats regardless of the number of syllables. This is a neat schematism, but its *a priori* psychological improbability is enormous. The tendency of some ears merely to count syllables and of others to measure rhythmic beats is a general phenomenon of human nature. Numerous English readers today are rendered uneasy by any deviation from the ten-syllabled English “heroic” iambic verse, while others take naturally to Swinburne’s twelve- or fourteen-syllabled lines. The natural human conflict and compromise between these two tendencies will explain all the relevant phenomena of Greek poetry far more satisfactorily than will the assumption of the prehistoric embodiment of each in rigid, distinct, and exclusive systems. The evidence alleged in proof of the existence of such systems is totally inadequate. It consists merely of Professor Schroeder’s inferences from perhaps a hundred lines of Aeolian and conjecturally popular verse, several hundred years later than Homer, and from a few Homeric hexameters that begin irregularly. This is not enough. The plain historical fact is that for us Greek poetry begins with a finished, quantitatively determined descending measure, the Homeric hexameter, and that one or two hundred years later we have already in Archilochus a wide variety of lyric measures, both ascending and descending. Conjectures concerning the prehistoric origin of these meters may be a fascinating philological inquiry, but they should be kept distinct from the study of meter as it is. We should not allow systematic views about the origin of Greek meters to influence our judgment of the actual movement of a given specimen of later Greek verse. That must be determined by our unbiased rhythmic instinct, supplemented by a minute study of the facts.

To apply these principles to the book before me would be to rewrite Professor Schroeder’s schemes. He may be partially right in feeling that there is more ascending movement in Greek lyric than the received logaoedic and dactylo-epitrite scansion brings out. But suspicion is necessarily aroused by the fact that he systematically assumes such

movement in the interests of a preconceived theory of metrical evolution. I must content myself in illustration with a few typical cases where my rhythmic feeling diverges slightly from his, and where I fail to see any evidence to support his reading, either in word-ending, phrase movement, or natural emphasis.

Eq. 1111 ff.:

ὦ Δῆμε καλὴν γ' ἔχεις
ἀρχήν, ὅτε πάντες ἄν—κτλ.

Aves 1731:

Ἦρα ποτ' Ὀλυμπία, κτλ.

Ran. 450:

τὸν ἡμέτερον τρόπον, κτλ.

In these Professor Schroeder's scansion would be possible if we knew that the music required it. But I see nothing to necessitate the sharp rhythmic bisection of the lines, which, if it means anything, involves an improbable pause in δ —τε and ἡμέ—τερον. It is only this systematic division that yields the regular ascending iambic movement ~ - - of the second half, and that lends any plausibility to the conjecture "strophæ structuram ex Aeolica Anacreontis strophæ γοννοῦμαί σ' ἐλαφηβόλε imitatione dixeris esse expressam." Unless we also divide systematically, artificially, and emphatically,

γοννοῦμαί σ', ἐ—λαφηβόλε
ξανθὴ παῖ Δι—ός, ἀγρίων

there is for the natural ear little resemblance between the two strophes.

In *Birds* 929, the division

τεῶ κε—φαλᾶ θέλεις

seems very arbitrary, as does in 1374 the treatment of

—πον πτερύγες—σι κοῖφαις

as ch. ba. And so in countless other passages the completion of the last choriamb of a series seems to have no motive except the determination to secure the favorite ending "ch. plus ba." and avoid recognition of the "cyclic" dactyl. And apart from this there still remains the question whether Professor Schroeder or any other metrist really can and does pronounce choriambes as ~ ~ ~ and not as approximately ~ ~ ~.

Finally, it is difficult to believe that Professor Schroeder himself actually recites sapphics according to the scheme given for them on p. 89: oooo+ch. ba; that is,

παῖ Διός δο—λοπλόκε λίσ—σομαί σε,
μή μ' ἄσαισι—μηδ' ὀνίαι—σι δάμνα.

And yet, if the description does not mean this, it is hard to say what it does mean. Why should we suppose that the entire Greek nation, with all its poets, was so obsessed by the choriambic jingle, which is a mannerism of Euripides' worst polyschematic glyconics, that whenever they saw the combination ~ ~ ~ they made a dash at it without regard to what happened to the remainder of the verse?

PAUL SHOREY